

### REMARKS

Claims 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Flam. Claims 2, 11, 21 and 38 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but have been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1, 4 - 10, 12 - 19, 27 - 37 and 39 have been rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 - 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,668,821. In response, Applicant submits the accompanying terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). Also enclosed is a check in the amount of \$55 to cover the required terminal disclaimer fee for a small entity.

In response to the rejection under §102(b), independent claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of dependent claim 11. Independent claim 31 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of dependent claim 35. Claims 11 and 35 are redundant in light of these amendments and have been canceled.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DORR, CARSON, SLOAN, BIRNEY & KRAMER, P.C.

Date: 9/22/04

By: Thomas S. Birney  
Thomas S. Birney #30,025  
3010 East 6th Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80206  
(303) 333-3010

Attorneys for Applicant